

Proficiency Tests

DLA

food
cosmetics
consumer goods
www.dla-lvu.de

Evaluation Report

proficiency test

DLA 13/2016

Allergen-Screening III:

**Cereals containing Gluten, Peanut, Lupine,
Celery and Sesame**

Dienstleistung Lebensmittel Analytik GbR
Waldemar-Bonsels-Weg 170
22926 Ahrensburg, Germany

proficiency-testing@dla-lvu.de www.dla-lvu.de

Coordinator of this PT:
Dr. Matthias Besler

1st Correction 26/06/2017:

The correction is related to the gluten determination by ELISA. One submitted result was not considered by mistake before. The result 18b was amended in the result part on page 11 and in the documentation on page 23.

Allgemeine Informationen zur Eignungsprüfung (EP)
General Information on the proficiency test (PT)

<i>EP-Anbieter</i> <i>PT-Provider</i>	DLA - Dienstleistung Lebensmittel Analytik GbR Gesellschafter: Dr. Gerhard Wichmann und Dr. Matthias Besler Waldemar-Bonsels-Weg 170, 22926 Ahrensburg, Germany Tel. ++49(0)171-1954375 Fax. ++49(0)4102-9944976 eMail. proficiency-testing@dla-lvu.de
<i>EP-Nummer</i> <i>PT-Number</i>	DLA 13/2016
<i>EP-Koordinator</i> <i>PT-Coordinator</i>	Dr. Matthias Besler
<i>Status des EP-Bericht</i> <i>Status of PT-Report</i>	Abschlussbericht / Final report (13 March 2017) 1. Korrektur / 1st Correction (26 June 2017) Gültig ist die jeweils letzte Version/Korrektur des Berichts. Sie ersetzt alle vorangegangenen Versionen. Only the latest version/correction of the report is valid. It replaces all preceding versions.
<i>EP-Bericht Freigabe</i> <i>PT-Report Authorization</i>	Dr. Matthias Besler (Technischer Leiter / Technical Manager) - <i>gezeichnet / signed M. Besler</i> Dr. Gerhard Wichmann (QM-Beauftragter / Quality Manager) - <i>gezeichnet / signed G. Wichmann</i> Datum / Date: 26 June 2017
<i>Unteraufträge</i> <i>Subcontractors</i>	Die Prüfung der Gehalte, Homogenität und Stabilität von EP-Parametern wird von DLA im Unterauftrag vergeben. The analysis of the content, homogeneity and stability of PT-parameters are subcontracted by DLA.

Inhalt/Content

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Realisation.....	5
2.1 Test material.....	5
2.1.1 Homogeneity.....	7
2.2 Sample shipment and information to the test.....	8
2.3 Submission of results.....	8
3. Evaluation.....	9
3.1 Agreement with consensus values from participants.....	9
3.2 Agreement with spiking of samples.....	9
4. Results.....	10
4.1 Proficiency Test Gluten Containing Cereals.....	11
4.1.1 ELISA-Results: Gluten.....	11
4.1.2 PCR-Results: Gluten Containing Cereals.....	12
4.1.2.1 PCR-Results: Gluten, in general.....	12
4.1.2.2 PCR-Results: Oat.....	13
4.1.2.3 PCR-Results: Rye.....	13
4.1.2.4 PCR-Results: Wheat.....	14
4.2 Proficiency Test Peanut.....	15
4.2.1 ELISA-Results: Peanut.....	15
4.2.2 PCR-Results: Peanut.....	16
4.3 Proficiency Test Lupine.....	17
4.3.1 ELISA-Results: Lupine.....	17
4.3.2 PCR-Results: Lupine.....	18
4.4 Proficiency Test Celery.....	19
4.4.1 ELISA-Results: Celery.....	19
4.4.2 PCR-Results: Celery.....	20
4.5 Proficiency Test Sesame.....	21
4.5.1 ELISA-Results: Sesame.....	21
4.5.2 PCR-Results: Sesame.....	22
5. Documentation.....	23
5.1 Details by the participants.....	23
5.1.1 ELISA: Gluten.....	23
5.1.2 ELISA: Peanut.....	24
5.1.3 ELISA: Lupine.....	25
5.1.4 ELISA: Sesame.....	26
5.1.5 PCR: Gluten Containing Cereals.....	27
5.1.5.1 PCR: Gluten, in general.....	27
5.1.5.2 PCR: Oat.....	28
5.1.5.3 PCR: Rye.....	28
5.1.5.4 PCR: Wheat.....	29
5.1.6 PCR: Peanut.....	30
5.1.7 PCR: Lupine.....	31
5.1.8 PCR: Celery.....	32
5.1.9 PCR: Sesame.....	33
5.2 Homogeneity.....	34
5.2.1 Mixture homogeneity before bottling.....	34

6. Index of participant laboratories.....36
7. Index of references.....37

1. Introduction

The participation in proficiency testing schemes is an essential element of the quality-management-system of every laboratory testing food and feed, cosmetics and food contact materials. The implementation of proficiency tests enables the participating laboratories to prove their own analytical competence under realistic conditions. At the same time they receive valuable data regarding the verification and/or validation of the particular testing method [1, 5].

The purpose of DLA is to offer proficiency tests for selected parameters in concentrations with practical relevance.

Realisation and evaluation of the present proficiency test follows the technical requirements of DIN EN ISO/IEC 17043 (2010) and DIN ISO 13528:2009 / ISO 13528:2015 [2, 3].

2. Realisation

2.1 Test material

Four PT-samples were provided for the qualitative detection of allergens in mg/kg range. To prepare the samples premixes were used at levels of about 5-10% of the allergenic ingredients concerned.

The respective raw materials were common in commerce cereal flakes, flours, nut butter, dried plant parts and seeds as well as fresh celery root, from which DLA produced allergen premixes (s. Tab. 2). If required the raw materials were crushed, dried, ground with the addition of carrier substances and sieved (mesh 400 µm) or sieved by means of a centrifugal mill (mesh 500 µm).

The composition of the basic matrix of PT samples 1-4 and of the allergen-premixes is given in table 1. The premixes were used for spiking of the PT-samples 1 to 4 (see Tab. 2).

After homogenisation the samples were portioned to approximately 20 g into metallised PET film bags.

Table 1: Composition of DLA-Samples

Ingredients	Samples 1 - 4
Potato powder (Ingredients: Potatoes, E471, E304, E223, E100)	74 - 76 %
Maltodextrin	24 - 26 %
Allergen-Premixes	0,10 - 0,50 %
<u>Ingredients:</u> - Maltodextrin (88% - 93%) - Sodium sulfate (0,0% - 5,5%) - Silicon dioxide (2,0% - 4,1%) - Allergens (5,0% - 10% each)	

Table 2: Added amounts of allergenic ingredients positive in mg/kg ranges** given as food item (for cereals as total protein)

Ingredients *	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Oat: Oat flakes, ground (Protein 12%)	positive (25 - 75)	negative	negative	negative
Rye: Rye flour Type 1150 (Protein 9,1%)	negative	positive (25 - 75)	negative	negative
Wheat: Wheat flour Type 550 (Protein 10,5%)	negative	negative	negative	positive (25 - 75)
Peanut: commercial peanut butter (Protein 30%)	negative	negative	positive (50 - 150)	positive (25 - 75)
Lupine: Sweet lupine flour, (Protein 37%)	negative	negative	positive (50 - 150)	negative
Celery: Leafs, dried (Protein 14%)	negative	positive (50 - 150)	negative	negative
Celery: Roots, dried (Protein 8,2%)	positive (75 - 225)	negative	negative	negative
Celery: Seeds, dried (Protein 20%)	negative	negative	negative	positive (50 - 150)
Sesame: Seeds black, dried (Protein 22%)	negative	positive (50 - 150)	negative	negative
Sesame: Seeds white, dried (Protein 23%)	positive (50 - 150)	negative	positive (50 - 150)	positive (25 - 75)


* Protein contents according to laboratory analysis of raw material (total nitrogen according to Kjeldahl)

**Allergen contents of „food item“ in brackets as indicated in the column of ingredients according gravimetric mixing

Note: The metrological traceability of temperature, mass and volume during production of the PT samples is ensured by DAkkS calibrated reference materials.

The detectability or absence of the allergens was tested by DLA using lateral flow assays. The results are in agreement with the spiking of the PT samples 1-4 (see Table 3).

Table 3: Verification of detectability of the added allergens by lateral flow assays (AgraStrip® LFD, Romer Labs®)

 Lateral Flow Device (LFD) *	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
AgraStrip® Gluten	negative	positive	negative	positive
AgraStrip® Peanut	negative	negative	positive	positive
AgraStrip® Lupin	negative	negative	positive	negative
AgraStrip® Sesame	positive	positive	positive	positive

* Nachweisgrenze jeweils 5 mg/kg / Limit of detection (LOD) 5 mg/kg each

2.1.1 Homogeneity

The **mixture homogeneity before bottling** was examined 8-fold by **micro-tracer analysis**. It is a standardized method that is part of the international GMP certification system for feed [14].

Before mixing dye coated iron particles of μm size are added to the sample and the number of particles is determined after homogenization in taken aliquots. The evaluation of the mixture homogeneity is based on the Poisson distribution using the chi-square test. A probability of $\geq 5\%$ is equivalent to a good homogeneous mixture and of $\geq 25\%$ to an excellent mixture [14, 15].

The microtracer analysis of the present PT samples 1-4 showed probabilities of 66%, 96%, 97% and 81%, respectively. Additionally particle number results were converted into concentrations, statistically evaluated according to normal distribution and compared to the standard deviation according to Horwitz. This gave a HorRat values of 0,8, 0,5, 0,5 and 0,7, respectively. The results of microtracer analysis are given in the documentation.

2.2 Sample shipment and information to the test

The portions of the test materials (sample 1 to 4) were sent to every participating laboratory in the 43rd week of 2016. The testing method was optional. The tests should be finished at December 9th 2016 the latest.

With the cover letter along with the sample shipment the following information was given to participants:

There are 4 different samples possibly containing the allergenic ingredients: Cereals containing Gluten, Peanut, Lupine, Celery and Sesame. The allergens are contained in a simple carrier matrix (75% potato powder / 25% maltodextrin) in the range of 50 - 250 mg/kg (Cereals could be higher and Gluten could be lower). The evaluation of results is strictly qualitative (positive / negative).

The following analysis methods can be used:

- a) ELISA and Lateral Flow
- b) PCR

In general we recommend to homogenize a representative sample amount before analysis according to good laboratory practice, especially in case of low sample weights.

2.3 Submission of results

The participants submitted their results in standard forms, which have been sent by email or were available on our website. The results given as positive/negative were evaluated.

Queried and documented were the indicated results and details of the test methods like specificity, test kit manufacturer and hints about the procedure.

In case participants submitted several results for the same parameter obtained by different methods these results were evaluated with the same evaluation number with a letter as a suffix and indication of the related method.

From 23 participants 22 submitted their results in time. One participant submitted the result delayed. Another laboratory canceled the participation in advance of sample shipment.

3. Evaluation

Different ELISA- and PCR-methods for the determination of allergens in foods are eventually using different antibodies and target-DNA, are usually calibrated with different reference materials and may utilize differing extraction methods. Among others this can induce different valuation of the presence and/or content of the analyte [23, 24, 25, 26]. Furthermore matrix- and/or processing of samples can have strong impact on the detectability of allergens by ELISA and PCR methods.

Therefore in the present PT the allergenic ingredients were provided for analysis in a simple matrix without further processing.

3.1 Agreement with consensus values from participants

The qualitative evaluation of the ELISA and PCR results of each participant was based on the agreement of the indicated results (positive or negative) with the **consensus values from participants**. A consensus value is determined unless $\geq 75\%$ positive or negative results are present for a parameter.

The assessment will be in the form that the number of matching results followed by the number of samples for which a consensus value was obtained is indicated. Behind that the agreement is expressed as the percentage in parentheses.

3.2 Agreement with spiking of samples

The qualitative evaluation of the ELISA and PCR results of each participant was based on the agreement of the indicated results (positive or negative) with the **spiking of the four PT-samples**. A consensus value is determined unless $\geq 75\%$ positive or negative results are present for a parameter.

The assessment will be in the form that the number of matching results followed by the number of samples is indicated. Behind that the agreement is expressed as the percentage in parentheses.

4. Results

All following tables are anonymized. With the delivering of the evaluation-report the participants are informed about their individual evaluation-number.

The qualitative evaluation is carried out for each parameter for ELISA and PCR methods separately. Results of lateral flow methods were valuated together with ELISA methods, because they are usually based on antibody detection.

The participant results and evaluation are tabulated as follows:

Evaluation number	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive				
Number negative				
Percent positive				
Percent negative				
Consensus value				
Spiking				

4.1 Proficiency Test Gluten Containing Cereals

4.1.1 ELISA-Results: Gluten

Qualitative valuation of results

Evaluation number	Sample 1 (Oat)	Sample 2 (Rye)	Sample 3 (none)	Sample 4 (Wheat)	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
12a	positive	positive	positive	positive	2/4 (50%)	3/4 (75%)	AQ	
12b	negative	positive	negative	positive	4/4 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	AS	
6a	negative	negative	negative	positive	3/4 (75%)	2/4 (50%)	GX	
6b	negative	negative	negative	positive	3/4 (75%)	2/4 (50%)	IG	
2	negative	positive	negative	positive	4/4 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	RS	
4	negative	positive	negative	positive	4/4 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	RS	
9	negative	positive	negative	positive	4/4 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	RS	
14	negative	positive	negative	positive	4/4 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	RS	
15	negative	positive	negative	positive	4/4 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	RS	
16	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/4 (75%)	4/4 (100%)	RS	
18a	negative	positive	negative	positive	4/4 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	RS	
20	positive	positive	positive	positive	2/4 (50%)	3/4 (75%)	RS	
3	negative	positive	negative	positive	4/4 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	RS-F	
8	negative	positive	positive	positive	3/4 (75%)	2/4 (50%)	RS-F	
18b	negative	positive	negative	positive	4/4 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	VT	
22	positive	positive	negative	negative	2/4 (50%)	3/4 (75%)	div	

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	4	14	3	15
Number negative	12	2	13	1
Percent positive	25	88	19	94
Percent negative	75	13	81	6
Consensus value	negative	positive	negative	positive
Spiking	positive	positive	negative	positive

Methods:

AQ = AgraQuant, RomerLabs
 AS = AgraStrip (Lateral Flow), RomerLabs
 GX = GlutenTox Sticks (Lateral Flow), Biomedal
 RS = Ridascreen®, R-Biopharm
 RS-F= Ridascreen® Fast, R-Biopharm
 VT = Veratox, Neogen
 div = not indicated / other method

Comments:

The consensus values of results are in qualitative agreement with the spiking for sample 2 (with rye), sample 3 (no added cereals) and sample 4 (with wheat).

For sample 1 containing oat a consensus value of 75% negative results was obtained. In total 12 out of 15 results were negative for gluten in sample 1. For valuation of results, it is important to consider whether the methods used are specified as suitable for the detection of oats or not.

4.1.2 PCR-Results: Gluten Containing Cereals

4.1.2.1 PCR-Results: Gluten, in general

Qualitative valuation of results

Evaluation number	Sample 1 (Oat)	Sample 2 (Rye)	Sample 3 (none)	Sample 4 (Wheat)	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
2	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	sample 1: oat added
16	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
23	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
7	negative	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	div	
10	negative	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	div	not detecting oat and barley
18	negative	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	div	w heat/rye/barley
19	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	4	7	0	7
Number negative	3	0	7	0
Percent positive	57	100	0	100
Percent negative	43	0	100	0
Consensus value	none	positive	negative	positive
Spiking	positive	positive	negative	positive

Methods:

SFA-ID = Sure Food Allergen ID, R-Biopharm / Congen
 div = not indicated / other method

Comments:

The consensus values of results are in qualitative agreement with the spiking for sample 2 (with rye), sample 3 (no added cereals) and sample 4 (with wheat).

For sample 1 containing oat no consensus value of $\geq 75\%$ positive or negative results was obtained. All results obtained by method SFA-ID were positive. For valuation of results, it is important to consider whether the methods used are specified as suitable for the detection of oats or not.

4.1.2.2 PCR-Results: Oat

Qualitative valuation of results

Evaluation number	Sample 1 (Oat)	Sample 2 (Rye)	Sample 3 (none)	Sample 4 (Wheat)	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
4	positive	negative	negative	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	GR	
18	positive	negative	negative	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	
19	positive	negative	negative	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	3	0	0	0
Number negative	0	3	3	3
Percent positive	100	0	0	0
Percent negative	0	100	100	100
Consensus value	positive	negative	negative	negative
Spiking	positive	negative	negative	negative

Methods:

GR = SPECIALfinder Assay, real time PCR, Generon
div = not indicated / other method

Comments:

The consensus values of results are in qualitative agreement with the spiking of sample 1 with oat.

4.1.2.3 PCR-Results: Rye

Qualitative valuation of results

Evaluation number	Sample 1 (Oat)	Sample 2 (Rye)	Sample 3 (none)	Sample 4 (Wheat)	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
4	negative	negative	negative	negative	3/4 (75%)	3/4 (75%)	GR	no positive sample detected
18	negative	negative	negative	negative	3/4 (75%)	3/4 (75%)	div	no positive sample detected
19	negative	-	negative	-	2/2 (100%)	2/2 (100%)	div	no positive sample detected

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	0	0	0	0
Number negative	3	2	3	2
Percent positive	0	0	0	0
Percent negative	100	100	100	100
Consensus value	negative	negative	negative	negative
Spiking	negative	positive	negative	negative

Methods:

GR = SPECIALfinder Assay, real time PCR, Generon
div = not indicated / other method

Comments:

None of the participants detected the addition of rye to sample 2.

4.1.2.4 PCR-Results: Wheat

Qualitative valuation of results

Evaluation number	Sample 1 (Oat)	Sample 2 (Rye)	Sample 3 (none)	Sample 4 (Wheat)	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
4	negative	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	GR	
22	negative	negative	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	MS	
19	negative	-	negative	-	2/2 (100%)	2/2 (100%)	div	no positive sample detected

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	0	1	0	2
Number negative	3	1	3	0
Percent positive	0	50	0	100
Percent negative	100	50	100	0
Consensus value	negative	none	negative	positive
Spiking	negative	negative	negative	positive

Methods:

GR = SPECIALfinder Assay, real time PCR, Generon

MS = Microsynth

div = not indicated / other method

Comments:

In qualitative agreement with the spiking wheat was detected by 2 participants in sample 4. For sample 2 (with rye) one positive and one negative result was reported. For valuation of results, it is important to consider whether the methods used are specified as specific for wheat alone or both wheat and rye.

4.2 Proficiency Test Peanut

4.2.1 ELISA-Results: Peanut

Qualitative valuation of results

Evaluation number	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
					Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
12a	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	AQ	
12b	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	AS	
20	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	BA	
14	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	BC	
18	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	BK	
2	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	ES	
6	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	NL-E	
4	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	RS-F	
16	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	RS-F	
17	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	RS-F	
15	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	VT	

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	0	0	11	11
Number negative	11	11	0	0
Percent positive	0	0	100	100
Percent negative	100	100	0	0
Consensus value	negative	negative	positive	positive
Spiking	negative	negative	positive	positive

Methods:

AQ = AgraQuant, RomerLabs
AS = AgraStrip (Lateral Flow), RomerLabs
BA = Bioavid (Lateral Flow), R-Biopharm
BC = BioCheck ELISA
BK = BioKits, Neogen
ES = ELISA-Systems
NL-E = nutriLinia®E Allergen-ELISA
RS-F= Ridascreen® Fast, R-Biopharm
VT = Veratox, Neogen

Comments:

The consensus values of results are in qualitative agreement with the spiking of samples.

4.2.2 PCR-Results: Peanut

Qualitative valuation of results

Evaluation number	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
1	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	ASU	
21	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	GI	
16	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	IC	
9	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	MS	
22	negative	negative	positive	negative	3/4 (75%)	3/4 (75%)	MS	sample with lower amount not detected
2	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
4	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
23	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
5	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	
7	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	
8	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	
10	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	
18	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	
19	negative	negative	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	0	0	14	13
Number negative	14	14	0	1
Percent positive	0	0	100	93
Percent negative	100	100	0	7
Consensus value	negative	negative	positive	positive
Spiking	negative	negative	positive	positive

Methods:

ASU = ASU §64 Methode/method

GI = GEN-IAL First Allergen, Coring System Diagnostix

IC = Food Allergen Detection PCR Kit, real Time PCR, InCura

MS = Microsynth

SFA-ID = Sure Food Allergen ID, R-Biopharm / Congen

div = not indicated / other method

Comments:

The consensus values of results are in qualitative agreement with the spiking of samples.

4.3 Proficiency Test Lupine

4.3.1 ELISA-Results: Lupine

Qualitative valuation of results

Evaluation number	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
12a	positive	positive	positive	positive	1/4 (25%)	1/4 (25%)	AQ	
12b	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	AS	
18	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	ES	
6	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	NL-E	
4	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	RS-F	
16	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	RS-F	
17	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	RS-F	

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	1	1	7	1
Number negative	6	6	0	6
Percent positive	14	14	100	14
Percent negative	86	86	0	86
Consensus value	negative	negative	positive	negative
Spiking	negative	negative	positive	negative

Methods:

AQ = AgraQuant, RomerLabs

AS = AgraStrip (Lateral Flow), RomerLabs

ES = ELISA-Systems

NL-E = nutriLinia®E Allergen-ELISA

RS-F= Ridascreen® Fast, R-Biopharm

Comments:

The consensus values of results are in qualitative agreement with the spiking of samples.

4.3.2 PCR-Results: Lupine**Qualitative valuation of results**

Evaluation number	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4	Qualitative Valuation Agreement with consensus value	Qualitative Valuation Agreement with spiking of samples	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg				
1	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	ASU	
10	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	ASU	
21	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	GI	
16	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	IC	
9	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	MS	
22	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	MS	
2	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
23	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
5	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	
7	positive	negative	positive	negative	3/4 (75%)	3/4 (75%)	div	
8	negative	positive	positive	negative	3/4 (75%)	3/4 (75%)	div	
18	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	
19	negative	negative	positive	negative	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	1	1	13	0
Number negative	12	12	0	13
Percent positive	8	8	100	0
Percent negative	92	92	0	100
Consensus value	negative	negative	positive	negative
Spiking	negative	negative	positive	negative

Methods:

ASU = ASU §64 Methode/method

GI = GEN-IAL First Allergen, Coring System Diagnostix

IC = Food Allergen Detection PCR Kit, real Time PCR, InCura

MS = Microsynth

SFA-ID = Sure Food Allergen ID, R-Biopharm / Congen

div = not indicated / other method

Comments:

The consensus values of results are in qualitative agreement with the spiking of samples.

4.4 Proficiency Test Celery

4.4.1 ELISA-Results: Celery

Comments:

None of the participants used the ELISA method for determination of celery.

4.4.2 PCR-Results: Celery

Qualitative valuation of results

Evaluation number	Sample 1 (Root)	Sample 2 (Leafs)	Sample 3 (none)	Sample 4 (Seed)	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
1	negative	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	ASU	
8	negative	negative	negative	negative	1/3 (33%)	1/4 (25%)	ASU	no positive sample detected
10	negative	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	ASU	
18	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	ASU	
19	negative	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	3/4 (75%)	ASU	
21	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	GI-4	
16	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	IC	
9	negative	positive	negative	negative	2/3 (67%)	2/4 (50%)	MS	
22	positive	positive	positive	positive	2/3 (67%)	3/4 (75%)	MS	
2	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
4	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
20	positive	negative	positive	positive	1/3 (33%)	2/4 (50%)	SFA-ID	
23	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
5	positive	positive	negative	negative	2/3 (67%)	3/4 (75%)	div	
12	negative	positive	negative	negative	2/3 (67%)	2/4 (50%)	div	
13	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/3 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	10	14	2	12
Number negative	6	2	14	4
Percent positive	63	88	13	75
Percent negative	38	13	88	25
Consensus value	none	positive	negative	positive
Spiking	positive	positive	negative	positive

Methods:

ASU = ASU §64 Methode/method
 GI-4= GEN-IAL First Allergen Tetra, Coring System Diagnostix
 IC = Food Allergen Detection PCR Kit, real Time PCR, InCura
 MS = Microsynth
 SFA-ID = Sure Food Allergen ID, R-Biopharm / Congen
 div = not indicated / other method

Comments:

The consensus values of results are in qualitative agreement with the spiking for sample 2 (with celery leafs), sample 3 (no added celery) and sample 4 (with celery seeds).

For sample 1 containing celery root no consensus value of $\geq 75\%$ positive or negative results was obtained. All results obtained by the methods GI-4, IC and SFA-ID were positive. For valuation of results, it is important to consider whether the methods used are specified as suitable for the detection of celery root and which limit of detection could be reached.

4.5 Proficiency Test Sesame

4.5.1 ELISA-Results: Sesame

Qualitative valuation of results

Evaluation number	Sample 1 (white)	Sample 2 (black)	Sample 3 (white)	Sample 4 (white)	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
					Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg				
12a	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	AQ	
12b	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	AS	
20	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	BA	
14	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	BC	
11	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	BK	
18	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	BK	
2	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	ES	
15	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	ES	
16	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	ES	
6	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	NL-E	
4	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	RS-F	
13	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	RS-F	
17	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	RS-F	

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	13	13	13	13
Number negative	0	0	0	0
Percent positive	100	100	100	100
Percent negative	0	0	0	0
Consensus value	positive	positive	positive	positive
Spiking	positive	positive	positive	positive

Methods:

AQ = AgraQuant, RomerLabs
AS = AgraStrip (Lateral Flow), RomerLabs
BA = Bioavid (Lateral Flow), R-Biopharm
BC = BioCheck ELISA
BK = BioKits, Neogen
ES = ELISA-Systems
NL-E = nutriLinia®E Allergen-ELISA
RS-F= Ridascreeen® Fast, R-Biopharm

Comments:

The consensus values of results are in qualitative agreement with the spiking of samples. None of the participants differentiated between black and white sesame.

4.5.2 PCR-Results: Sesame**Qualitative valuation of results**

Evaluation number	Sample 1 (white)	Sample 2 (black)	Sample 3 (white)	Sample 4 (white)	Qualitative Valuation	Qualitative Valuation	Method	Remarks
	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	pos/neg	Agreement with consensus value	Agreement with spiking of samples		
10	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	ASU	
21	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	GI-4	
16	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	IC	
9	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	MS	
22	negative	negative	negative	negative	0/4 (0%)	0/4 (0%)	MS	keine Positiveprobe identifiziert
2	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
23	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	SFA-ID	
5	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	
8	positive	positive	negative	positive	3/4 (75%)	3/4 (75%)	div	
18	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	
19	positive	positive	positive	positive	4/4 (100%)	4/4 (100%)	div	

	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 4
Number positive	10	10	9	10
Number negative	1	1	2	1
Percent positive	91	91	82	91
Percent negative	9	9	18	9
Consensus value	positive	positive	positive	positive
Spiking	positive	positive	positive	positive

Methods:

ASU = ASU §64 Methode/method

GI-4= GEN-IAL First Allergen Tetra, Coring System Diagnostix

IC = Food Allergen Detection PCR Kit, real Time PCR, InCura

MS = Microsynth

SFA-ID = Sure Food Allergen ID, R-Biopharm / Congen

div = not indicated / other method

Comments:

The consensus values of results are in qualitative agreement with the spiking of samples. None of the participants differentiated between black and white sesame.

5. Documentation

5.1 Details by the participants

Note: Information given in German was translated by DLA to the best of our knowledge (without guarantee of correctness).

5.1.1 ELISA: Gluten

Primary data

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
AQ	12a	positive	positive	positive	positive	2	Food	AgraQuant, RomerLabs
AS	12b	negative	positive	negative	positive	20	Food	AgraStrip, RomerLabs
GX	6a	negative	negative	negative	positive	3		GlutenTox Sticks Plus
IG	6b	negative	negative	negative	positive	5	Gluten	Ingezim Gluten-INGENASA
RS	2	negative	positive	negative	positive	5	Gluten	Ridascreen, r-Biopharm
RS	4	negative	positive	negative	positive	5	Gluten	Ridascreen, r-Biopharm
RS	9	negative	positive	negative	positive	1,5	Gluten	Ridascreen, r-Biopharm
RS	14	negative	positive	negative	positive	5	Gluten	Ridascreen, r-Biopharm
RS	15	negative	positive	negative	positive		Gliadin	Ridascreen, r-Biopharm
RS	16	positive	positive	negative	positive	3	Gluten	Ridascreen, r-Biopharm
RS	18a	negative	positive	negative	positive	3	Gluten	Ridascreen, r-Biopharm
RS	20	2,7	40	2,8	57,5	2	Gluten	Ridascreen, r-Biopharm
RS-F	3	negative	positive	negative	positive	< 10	Gluten	Ridascreen Fast, r-Biopharm
RS-F	8	negative	167	14	41	4	Gluten	Ridascreen Fast, r-Biopharm
VT	18b	negative	positive	negative	positive	8	Gluten	Veratox Allergen, Neogen
div	22	positive	positive	negative	negative	10	Gliadin	in house

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Antibody	e.g. Extraction Solution / Time / Temperature	
AQ	12a	COKAL0200			
AS	12b	COKAL0200AS			
GX	6a	KT-5340			
IG	6b			Extraction solution+Ethnol 80%/120 min/RT	
RS	2			As Per Kit Instructions	
RS	4	R7001	As Per Kit Instructions	As Per Kit Instructions	
RS	9	R7001	R5	As Per Kit Instructions; addition of milk powder (1:2 to sample amount)	43,1 mg/kg; sample 4: 44,9 mg/kg
RS	14			60°C extraction	
RS	15	R7001			
RS	16				
RS	18a	R7001	R5, Prolamine from wheat, rye and barley	As Per Kit Instructions	
RS	20	R7001		Cocktail solution and ethanol solution 70 %	
RS-F	3	11186		RIDA Extraction solution	
RS-F	8	R7002	R5		
VT	18b	8480	R5, Prolamins from wheat, rye and barley	As Per Kit Instructions	
div	22			in house MeOH- Extraction	

5.1.2 ELISA: Peanut*Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
AQ	12a	negative	negative	positive	positive	0,1	Food	AgraQuant, RomerLabs
AS	12b	negative	negative	positive	positive	1	Food	AgraStrip, RomerLabs
BA	20	negative	negative	positive	positive		Food item, total	bioavid
BC	14	negative	negative	positive	positive	1	Whole peanut	BioCheck
BK	18	negative	negative	positive	positive	0,5	Food item, total	BioKits Assay Kit, Neogen
ES	2	negative	negative	positive	positive	1	Protein	ELISA-Systems, Residue Assay
NL-E	6	negative	negative	positive	positive	3	Food item, total	nutriLinia E ELISA, Transia
RS-F	4	negative	negative	positive	positive	2,5	Food item, total	Ridascreen Fast, r-Biopharm
RS-F	16	negative	negative	positive	positive	1,5		Ridascreen Fast, r-Biopharm
RS-F	17	negative	negative	positive	positive	0,13	Peanut	Ridascreen Fast, r-Biopharm
VT	15	negative	negative	positive	positive		Food item, total	Veratox Allergen, Neogen

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Antibody	e.g. Extraction Solution / Time / Temperature	
AQ	12a	COKAL0148			
AS	12b	COKAL0110AS			
BA	20			aqueous extraction	
BC	14	Biocheck Peanut Check		60° extraction	
BK	18	902048Q	Conarachin-A	As Per Kit Instructions	peanut
ES	2			As Per Kit Instructions	same results with Ridascreen Fast
NL-E	6			Extraction solution/15 min/60°C	
RS-F	4	R6202	As Per Kit Instructions	As Per Kit Instructions	
RS-F	16				
RS-F	17	R6202	Antibodies against peanut protein	Allergen extraction buffer 10 min 60°C	
VT	15	8430			

5.1.3 ELISA: Lupine*Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
AQ	12a	positive	positive	positive	positive	0,2	Food	AgraQuant, RomerLabs
AS	12b	negative	negative	positive	negative	10	Food	AgraStrip, RomerLabs
ES	18	negative	negative	positive	negative	0,25		ELISA-Systems, Residue Assay
NL-E	6	negative	negative	positive	negative	2	Food item, total	nutriLinia E ELISA, Transia
RS-F	4	negative	negative	positive	negative	1	Lupin Protein	Ridascreen Fast, r-Bio-pharm
RS-F	16	negative	negative	positive	negative	0,6		Ridascreen Fast, r-Bio-pharm
RS-F	17	negative	negative	positive	negative	0,7	Protein	Ridascreen Fast, r-Bio-pharm

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Antibody	e.g. Extraction Solution / Time / Temperature	
AQ	12a	COKAL1548			
AS	12b	COKAL1510AS			
ES	18	ESLFP-48	Lupine flour proteins	As Per Kit Instructions	Lupine flour protein
NL-E	6			Extraction solution/15 min/60°C	
RS-F	4	R6102	As Per Kit Instructions	As Per Kit Instructions	
RS-F	16				
RS-F	17	R6102	Antibodies specific for protein including y-conglutin and against all food and feed relevant european sweet lupine species (Lupinus albus, luteus and angustifolius)	Allergen extraction buffer 10 min 60°C	

5.1.4 ELISA: Sesame*Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
AQ	12a	positive	positive	positive	positive	0,2		AgraQuant, RomerLabs
AS	12b	positive	positive	positive	positive	5	Food	AgraStrip, RomerLabs
BA	20	positive	positive	positive	positive		Food item, total	bioavid
BC	14	positive	positive	positive	positive	2	Whole sesame	BioCheck
BK	11	positive	positive	positive	positive	6,25	Food item, total	BioKits Assay Kit, Neogen
BK	18	positive	positive	positive	positive	1,5	Food item, total	BioKits Assay Kit, Neogen
ES	2	positive	positive	positive	positive	0,5	Protein	ELISA-Systems, Residue Assay
ES	15	positive	positive	positive	positive		Food item, total	ELISA-Systems, Residue Assay
ES	16	positive	positive	positive	positive	0,25		ELISA-Systems, Residue Assay
NL-E	6	positive	positive	positive	positive	2	Food item, total	nutriLinia E ELISA, Transia
RS-F	4	positive	positive	positive	positive	2,5	Food item, total	Ridascreen Fast, r-Biopharm
RS-F	13	positive	positive	positive	positive	2,5		Ridascreen, r-Biopharm
RS-F	17	positive	positive	positive	positive	0,2	Sesame	Ridascreen Fast, r-Biopharm

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Antibody	e.g. Extraction Solution / Time / Temperature	
AQ	12a	COKAL1948			
AS	12b	COKAL1910AS			
BA	20			aqueous extraction	
BC	14	Biocheck Sesame Check		60° extraction	
BK	11	902070X	Sesame protein	Samples extracted in Biokits extraction buffer by shaking at 150rpm in orbital incubator at room temperature for 15 minutes	
BK	18	902070X	Sesame proteins	As Per Kit Instructions	Sesame
ES	2			As Per Kit Instructions	
ES	15	ESSESRD-48			
ES	16				
NL-E	6			Extraction solution/15 min/60°C	
RS-F	4	R7202	As Per Kit Instructions	As Per Kit Instructions	
RS-F	13	ELISA			
RS-F	17	R7202	specific against sesame protein	Allergen extraction buffer 10 min 60°C	

5.1.5 PCR: Gluten Containing Cereals**5.1.5.1 PCR: Gluten, in general***Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
SFA-ID	2	positive	positive	negative	positive	0,4	Allergen-DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
SFA-ID	16	positive	positive	negative	positive	0,4	Allergen DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
SFA-ID	23	positive	positive	negative	positive	0,4	Cereal-DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
div	7	negative	positive	negative	positive	25	Allergen-DNA	in house method
div	10	negative	positive	negative	positive	20	Food item, total	ASU §64
div	18	negative	positive	negative	positive	4	Allergen-DNA	
div	19	positive	positive	negative	positive			in house method

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Target-DNA	e.g. Extraction / Enzymes / Clean-Up / Real Time PCR / Gel electrophoresis / Cycles	
SFA-ID	2			As Per Kit Instructions	sample 1 oat added
SFA-ID	16				
SFA-ID	23	S3106		Real Time PCR	
div	7	-	PRP8	CTAB, magnetic beads	
div	10	ASU No. not available yet	high molecular weight (HMW) Glutenin Gen B1-1 from wheat and 1-R from rye	CTAB/QIAQuick, s. e.g. ASU L 08.00-59	oat and barley could not be detected; Method: § 64 in press; Reference: Detection and quantitation of wheat and/or rye by real-time PCR. Literature: Zeltner D, Glomb MA, Maede D (2009) Real-time PCR systems for the detection of the gluten-containing cereals wheat, spelt, kamut, rye, barley and oat. Eur Food Res Technol 228:321-330
div	18	Eur F Res Tech 212 (2001) 228ff., mod		CTAB/Proteinase K/Promega Wizard DNA CleanUp/Gelelektrophorese/45 Cycles	Wheat/Rye/Barley
div	19			Silica-columns, Real-Time PCR, 45 cycles	

5.1.5.2 PCR: Oat*Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
GR	4	positive	negative	negative	negative	10	Food item, total	Generon Oats Assay
div	18	positive	negative	negative	negative	10-20	Allergen-DNA	in house method
div	19	positive	negative	negative	negative			in house method

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Target-DNA	e.g. Extraction / Enzymes / Clean-Up / Real Time PCR / Gel electrophoresis / Cycles	
GR	4	PAV11A	As Per Kit Instructions	As Per Kit Instructions	Generon Oats Assay
div	18			CTAB/Proteinase K/Promega Wizard DNA CleanUp/Gelelektrophorese/45 Cycles	
div	19			Silica-columns, Real-Time PCR, 45 cycles	

5.1.5.3 PCR: Rye*Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
GR	4	negative	negative	negative	negative	10	Food item, total	Generon Rye Assay
div	18	negative	negative	negative	negative	10-20	Allergen-DNA	in house method
div	19	negative	-	negative	-			in house method

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Target-DNA	e.g. Extraction / Enzymes / Clean-Up / Real Time PCR / Gel electrophoresis / Cycles	
GR	4	PAV10A	As Per Kit Instructions	As Per Kit Instructions	Generon Rye Assay
div	18			CTAB/Proteinase K/Promega Wizard DNA CleanUp/Gelelektrophorese/45 Cyclen	
div	19			Silica-columns, Real-Time PCR, 45 cycles	Rye and wheat is not differentiated

5.1.5.4 PCR: Wheat*Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
GR	4	negative	positive	negative	positive	1	Food item, total	Generon Wheat Assay
MS	22	negative	negative	negative	positive	100	Food item, total	Microsynth
div	19	negative	-	negative	-			in house method

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Target-DNA	e.g. Extraction / Enzymes / Clean-Up / Real Time PCR / Gel electrophoresis / Cycles	
GR	4	PGE29A	As Per Kit Instructions	As Per Kit Instructions	Generon Wheat Assay
MS	22			Wizard/Rotorgene Realtime/45	
div	19			Silica-columns, Real-Time PCR, 45 cycles	Rye and wheat is not differentiated

5.1.6 PCR: Peanut*Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
ASU	1	negative	negative	positive	positive			ASU §64
GI	21	negative	negative	positive	positive			GEN-IAL First-Peanut (Erdnuss)/Coring
IC	16	negative	negative	positive	positive	1	Allergen DNA	Incura
MS	9	negative	negative	positive	positive	0,005%	Allergen-DNA	Microsynth
MS	22	negative	negative	positive	negative	100	Food item, total	Microsynth
SFA-ID	2	negative	negative	positive	positive	1,5	Allergen-DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
SFA-ID	4	negative	negative	positive	positive	1	Food item, total	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
SFA-ID	23	negative	negative	positive	positive	1,5	Peanut-DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
div	5	negative	negative	positive	positive	0,008	Allergen DNA	in-house method
div	7	negative	negative	positive	positive	25	Allergen-DNA	in-house method
div	8	negative	negative	positive	positive	0,01%	Allergen-DNA	in-house method
div	10	negative	negative	positive	positive	5	Food item, total	Köppel et al (2010) Eur. Food Res. Technol. 230: 367-374.
div	18	negative	negative	positive	positive	40	Allergen-DNA	in-house method
div	19	negative	negative	positive	positive			in-house method

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Target-DNA	e.g. Extraction / Enzymes / Clean-Up / Real Time PCR / Gel electrophoresis / Cycles	
ASU	1	L 44.00-11	peanut	Extraction with Wizard DNA Clean-Up System	
GI	21			Real-time PCR	
IC	16				
MS	9		peanut-DNA	Macherey Nagel Nucleo Spin Food optimized: increased sample weight, buffer change (washing with Lysis Buffer) RNase-step, Chloroform-step, 2xCCQW; RealTime PCR with 45 cycles, decontamination step with UNG; own thermoprofile; Inhibition control	Reference material: ground peanuts
MS	22			Wizard/Rotorgene Realtime/45	
SFA-ID	2			As Per Kit Instructions	
SFA-ID	4	S3103	As Per Kit Instructions	As Per Kit Instructions	
SFA-ID	23	S3103		Real Time PCR	
div	5				
div	7		Ara d2	CTAB, magnetic beads	
div	8	Scaravelli et al., 2008		RealTime PCR	
div	10		Cor A 1	CTAB/QIAQuick, s. z.B. ASU L 08.00-59	
div	18			CTAB/Proteinase K/Promega Wizard DNA CleanUp/Real-time PCR/45 Cycles	
div	19			Silica-columns, Real-Time PCR, 45 cycles	

5.1.7 PCR: Lupine*Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
ASU	1	negative	negative	positive	negative			ASU §64
ASU	10	negative	negative	positive	negative	5	Food item, total	ASU §64
GI	21	negative	negative	positive	negative			GEN-IAL First-Lupine /Co-ring
IC	16	negative	negative	positive	negative	1	Allergen DNA	Incura
MS	9	negative	negative	positive	negative	0,01%	Allergen-DNA	Microsynth
MS	22	negative	negative	negative	negative	100	Food item, total	Microsynth
SFA-ID	2	negative	negative	positive	negative	0,4	Allergen-DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
SFA-ID	23	negative	negative	positive	negative	0,4	Lupin-DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
div	5	negative	negative	positive	negative	0,008	Allergen DNA	in-house method
div	7	positive	negative	positive	negative	25	Allergen-DNA	in-house method
div	8	negative	positive	positive	negative	0,01%	Allergen-DNA	in-house method
div	18	negative	negative	positive	negative	10	Allergen-DNA	in-house method
div	19	negative	negative	positive	negative			in-house method

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Target-DNA	e.g. Extraction / Enzymes / Clean-Up / Real Time PCR / Gel electrophoresis / Cycles	
ASU	1	L 18.00-22	Lupine	Extraction with Wizard DNA Clean-Up System	
ASU	10	L 08.00-58	s. ASU	CTAB/QIAQuick, s. e.g. ASU L 08.00-59	result given as Lupinus albus
GI	21			Real-time PCR	
IC	16				
MS	9		Lupine-DNA	Macherey Nagel Nucleo Spin Food optimized: increased sample weight, buffer change (washing with Lysis Buffer) RNase-step, Chloroform-step, 2xCQW; RealTime PCR with 45 cycles, decontamination step with UNG; own thermoprofile; Inhibition control	Reference material: spiked sausage
MS	22			Wizard/Rotorgene Realtime/45	
SFA-ID	2			As Per Kit Instructions	
SFA-ID	23	S3111		Real Time PCR	
div	5				
div	7	-	IST	CTAB, magnetic beads	
div	8	Denmel et al., 2008		RealTime PCR	
div	18			CTAB/Proteinase K/Promega Wizard DNA CleanUp/Real-time PCR/45 Cyclen	
div	19			Silica-columns, Real-Time PCR, 45 cycles	

5.1.8 PCR: Celery*Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
ASU	1	negative	positive	negative	positive			ASU §64
ASU	8	negative	negative	negative	negative	0,01%	Allergen-DNA	
ASU	10	negative	positive	negative	positive	5	Food item, total	ASU §64
ASU	18	positive	positive	negative	positive	4	Allergen-DNA	ASU §64
ASU	19	negative	positive	negative	positive			ASU §64
GI-4	21	positive	positive	negative	positive			GEN-IAL First-Allergen Tetra I (celery, sesame, mustard)/Coring
IC	16	positive	positive	negative	positive	10	Allergen DNA	Incura
MS	9	negative	positive	negative	negative	0,01%	Allergen-DNA	Microsynth
MS	22	positive	positive	positive	positive	100	Food item, total	Microsynth
SFA-ID	2	positive	positive	negative	positive	0,4	Allergen-DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
SFA-ID	4	positive	positive	negative	positive	1	Food item, total	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
SFA-ID	20	positive	negative	positive	positive		Food item, total	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
SFA-ID	23	positive	positive	negative	positive	0,4	Celery-DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
div	5	positive	positive	negative	negative	0,008	Allergen DNA	in-house method
div	12	negative	positive	negative	negative	100	Food	in-house method
div	13	positive	positive	negative	positive		Allergen DNA	

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specificity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Target-DNA	e.g. Extraction / Enzymes / Clean-Up / Real Time PCR / Gel electrophoresis / Cycles	
ASU	1	L 08.00-56	Celery	Extraction with Wizard DNA Clean-Up System	
ASU	8	ASU §64		RealTime PCR	
ASU	10	L 08.00-56	s. ASU	CTAB/QIA Quick, s. e.g. ASU L 08.00-59	result given as celery seed
ASU	18	L 08.00-56, mod.		CTAB/Proteinase K/Promega Wizard DNA CleanUp/Real-time PCR/45 Cycles	
ASU	19	L08.00-56		Silica-columns, Real-Time PCR, 45 cycles	
GI-4	21			Real-time PCR	
IC	16				
MS	9		Celery-DNA	Macherey Nagel Nucleo Spin Food optimized: increased sample weight, buffer change (washing with Lysis Buffer) RNase-step, Chloroform-step, 2xCQW; RealTime PCR with 45 cycles, decontamination step with UNG; own thermoprofile; Inhibition control	Reference material: dried celery root
MS	22			Wizard/Rotorgene Realtime/45	
SFA-ID	2			As Per Kit Instructions	
SFA-ID	4	S3105	As Per Kit Instructions	As Per Kit Instructions	
SFA-ID	20			QIAgen DNA Extraction	
SFA-ID	23	S3105		Real Time PCR	
div	5				
div	12			Real Time PCR	
div	13	PB-22/LM w yd.1 z dn. 15.11.2016			

5.1.9 PCR: Sesame*Primary data*

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Result Sample 1	Result Sample 2	Result Sample 3	Result Sample 4	Limit of detection	Limit of detection given as	Method
		qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	qualitative	mg/kg	e.g. food / food protein	Test-Kit + Provider
ASU	10	positive	positive	positive	positive	5	Food item, total	ASU §64
GI-4	21	positive	positive	positive	positive			GEN-IAL First-Allergen Tetra I (celery, sesame, mustard)/Coring
IC	16	positive	positive	positive	positive	2	Allergen DNA	Incura
MS	9	positive	positive	positive	positive	0,005%	Allergen-DNA	Microsynth
MS	22	negative	negative	negative	negative	100	Food item, total	Microsynth
SFA-ID	2	positive	positive	positive	positive	0,4	Allergen-DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
SFA-ID	23	positive	positive	positive	positive	0,4	Sesame-DNA	Sure Food Allergen ID, Congen / r-Biopharm
div	5	positive	positive	positive	positive	0,008	Allergen DNA	in-house method
div	8	positive	positive	negative	positive	0,01%	Allergen-DNA	in-house method
div	18	positive	positive	positive	positive	40	Allergen-DNA	in-house method
div	19	positive	positive	positive	positive			in-house method

Other details to the Methods

Meth. Abr.	Evaluation number	Method-No. / Test-Kit No.	Specifity	Remarks to the Method (Extraction and Determination)	Further Remarks
		Article-No. / ASU-No.	Target-DNA	e.g. Extraction / Enzymes / Clean-Up / Real Time PCR / Gel electrophoresis / Cycles	
ASU	10	L 18.00-22	s. ASU	CTAB/QIAQuick, s. e.g. ASU L 08.00-59	L 18.00-22
GI-4	21			Real-time PCR	
IC	16				
MS	9		Sesame-DNA	Macherey Nagel Nucleo Spin Food optimized: increased sample weight, buffer change (washing with Lysis Buffer) RNase-step, Chloroform-step, 2xCQW; RealTime PCR with 45 cycles, decontamination step with UNG; own thermoprofile; Inhibition control	
MS	22			Wizard/Rotorgene Realtime/45	
SFA-ID	2			As Per Kit Instructions	
SFA-ID	23	S3108		Real Time PCR	S3108
div	5				
div	8	Köppel et al., 2010	Oleosin	RealTime PCR	Köppel et al., 2010
div	18			CTAB/Proteinase K/Promega Wizard DNA CleanUp/Real-time PCR/45 Cycles	
div	19			Silica-columns, Real-Time PCR, 45 cycles	

5.2 Homogeneity

5.2.1 Mixture homogeneity before bottling

Microtracer Homogeneity Test

DLA 13-2016 Sample 1

Weight whole sample	1,01	kg
Microtracer	FSS-rot lake	
Particle size	75 – 300	µm
Weight per particle	2,0	µg
Addition of tracer	62,3	mg/kg

Result of analysis

Sample	Weight [g]	Particle number	Particles [mg/kg]
1	5,19	166	64,0
2	5,27	165	62,6
3	5,12	172	67,2
4	5,03	177	70,4
5	5,10	164	64,3
6	5,05	168	66,5
7	5,24	147	56,1
8	4,95	166	67,1

Poisson distribution

Number of samples	8	
Degree of freedom	7	
Mean	166	Particles
Standard deviation	10,9	Particles
χ^2 (CHI-Quadrat)	4,99	
Probability	66	%
Recovery rate	104	%

Normal distribution

Number of samples	8	
Mean	64,8	mg/kg
Standard deviation	4,25	mg/kg
rel. Standard deviation	6,56	%
Horwitz standard deviation	8,54	%
HorRat-value	0,77	
Recovery rate	104	%

Microtracer Homogeneity Test

DLA 13-2016 Sample 2

Weight whole sample	1,01	kg
Microtracer	FSS-rot lake	
Particle size	75 – 300	µm
Weight per particle	2,0	µg
Addition of tracer	47,5	mg/kg

Result of analysis

Sample	Weight [g]	Particle number	Particles [mg/kg]
1	5,16	142	55,0
2	5,24	156	59,5
3	5,13	145	56,5
4	5,05	153	60,6
5	5,18	153	59,1
6	5,07	152	60,0
7	5,14	137	53,3
8	5,24	151	57,6

Poisson distribution

Number of samples	8	
Degree of freedom	7	
Mean	149	Particles
Standard deviation	6,64	Particles
χ^2 (CHI-Quadrat)	2,08	
Probability	96	%
Recovery rate	121	%

Normal distribution

Number of samples	8	
Mean	57,7	mg/kg
Standard deviation	2,58	mg/kg
rel. Standard deviation	4,47	%
Horwitz standard deviation	8,69	%
HorRat-value	0,51	
Recovery rate	121	%

Microtracer Homogeneity Test

DLA 13-2016 Sample 3

Weight whole sample	1,00	kg
Microtracer	FSS-rot lake	
Particle size	75 – 300	µm
Weight per particle	2,0	µg
Addition of tracer	45,2	mg/kg

Result of analysis

Sample	Weight [g]	Particle number	Particles [mg/kg]
1	5,01	126	50,3
2	5,18	125	48,3
3	5,05	130	51,5
4	5,05	123	48,7
5	5,09	136	53,4
6	5,19	138	53,2
7	5,15	123	47,8
8	4,63	122	52,7

Poisson distribution		
Number of samples	8	
Degree of freedom	7	
Mean	128	Particles
Standard deviation	5,79	Particles
χ ² (CHI-Quadrat)	1,83	
Probability	97	%
Recovery rate	112	%

Normal distribution		
Number of samples	8	
Mean	50,7	mg/kg
Standard deviation	2,30	mg/kg
rel. Standard deviaton	4,53	%
Horwitz standard deviation	8,86	%
HorRat-value	0,51	
Recovery rate	112	%

Microtracer Homogeneity Test

DLA 13-2016 Sample 4

Weight whole sample	1,01	kg
Microtracer	FSS-rot lake	
Particle size	75 – 300	µm
Weight per particle	2,0	µg
Addition of tracer	59,5	mg/kg

Result of analysis

Sample	Weight [g]	Particle number	Particles [mg/kg]
1	5,15	178	69,1
2	5,05	182	72,1
3	5,16	180	69,8
4	5,09	188	73,9
5	5,09	179	70,3
6	5,12	183	71,5
7	5,04	158	62,7
8	4,63	175	75,6

Poisson distribution		
Number of samples	8	
Degree of freedom	7	
Mean	178	Particles
Standard deviation	9,71	Particles
χ ² (CHI-Quadrat)	3,71	
Probability	81	%
Recovery rate	119	%

Normal distribution		
Number of samples	8	
Mean	70,6	mg/kg
Standard deviation	3,85	mg/kg
rel. Standard deviaton	5,46	%
Horwitz standard deviation	8,43	%
HorRat-value	0,65	
Recovery rate	119	%

6. Index of participant laboratories

Teilnehmer / Participant	Ort / Town	Land / Country
		GREAT BRITAIN
		SPAIN
		Germany
		ITALY
		Germany
		Germany
		Germany
		Germany
		AUSTRIA
		Germany
		POLAND
		SWITZERLAND
		Germany
		Germany
		Germany
		AUSTRIA
		GREAT BRITAIN
		FRANCE
		Germany
		Germany
		GREAT BRITAIN
		AUSTRIA
		CANADA

[Die Adressdaten der Teilnehmer wurden für die allgemeine Veröffentlichung des Auswertebereichs nicht angegeben.]

[The address data of the participants were deleted for publication of the evaluation report.]

7. Index of references

1. DIN EN ISO/IEC 17025:2005; Allgemeine Anforderungen an die Kompetenz von Prüf- und Kalibrierlaboratorien / General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories
2. DIN EN ISO/IEC 17043:2010; Konformitätsbewertung - Allgemeine Anforderungen an Eignungsprüfungen / Conformity assessment - General requirements for proficiency testing
3. ISO 13528:2015 & DIN ISO 13528:2009; Statistische Verfahren für Eignungsprüfungen durch Ringversuche / Statistical methods for use in proficiency testing by interlaboratory comparisons
4. ASU §64 LFGB: Planung und statistische Auswertung von Ringversuchen zur Methodvalidierung / DIN ISO 5725 series part 1, 2 and 6 Accuracy (trueness and precision) of measurement methods and results
5. Verordnung / Regulation 882/2004/EU; Verordnung über über amtliche Kontrollen zur Überprüfung der Einhaltung des Lebensmittel- und Futtermittelrechts sowie der Bestimmungen über Tiergesundheit und Tierschutz / Regulation on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules
6. Evaluation of analytical methods used for regulation of food and drugs; W. Horwitz; Analytical Chemistry, 54, 67-76 (1982)
7. The International Harmonised Protocol for the Proficiency Testing of Analytical Laboratories ; J.AOAC Int., 76(4), 926 - 940 (1993)
8. A Horwitz-like funktion describes precision in proficiency test; M. Thompson, P.J. Lowthian; Analyst, 120, 271-272 (1995)
9. Protocol for the design, conduct and interpretation of method performance studies; W. Horwitz; Pure & Applied Chemistry, 67, 331-343 (1995)
10. Recent trends in inter-laboratory precision at ppb and sub-ppb concentrations in relation to fitness for purpose criteria in proficiency testing; M. Thompson; Analyst, 125, 385-386 (2000)
11. The International Harmonised Protocol for the Proficiency Testing of Analytical Chemistry Laboratories; Pure Appl Chem, 78, 145 - 196 (2006)
12. AMC Kernel Density - Representing data distributions with kernel density estimates, amc technical brief, Editor M Thompson, Analytical Methods Committee, AMCTB No 4, Revised March 2006 and Excel Add-in Kernel.xla 1.0e by Royal Society of Chemistry
13. EURACHEM/CITAC Leitfaden, Ermittlung der Messunsicherheit bei analytischen Messungen (2003); Quantifying Uncertainty in Analytical Measurement (1999)
14. GMP+ Feed Certification scheme, Module: Feed Safety Assurance, chapter 5.7 Checking procedure for the process accuracy of compound feed with micro tracers in GMP+ BA2 Control of residues, Version: 1st of January 2015 GMP+ International B.V.
15. MTSE SOP No. 010.01 (2014): Quantitative measurement of mixing uniformity and carry-over in powder mixtures with the rotary detector technique, MTSE Micro Tracers Services Europe GmbH
16. Codex Alimentarius Commission (2010) - Guidelines on performance criteria and validation of methods for detection, identification and quantification of specific DNA sequences and specific proteins in foods, CAC/GL 74-2010
17. DIN EN ISO 15633-1:2009; Nachweis von Lebensmittelallergenen mit immunologischen Verfahren - Teil 1: Allgemeine Betrachtungen / Foodstuffs - Detection of food allergens by immunological methods - Part 1: General considerations
18. DIN EN ISO 15634-1:2009; Nachweis von Lebensmittelallergenen mit molekularbiologischen Verfahren - Teil 1: Allgemeine Betrachtungen / Foodstuffs - Detection of food allergens by molecular biological methods - Part 1: General considerations
19. DIN EN ISO 15842:2010 Lebensmittel - Nachweis von Lebensmittelallergenen - Allgemeine Betrachtungen und Validierung von Verfahren / Foodstuffs - Detection of food allergens - General considerations and validation of

- methods
20. Ministry of Health and Welfare, JSM, Japan 2006
 21. Working Group Food Allergens, Abbott et al., Validation Procedures for Quantitative Food Allergen ELISA Methods: Community Guidance and Best Practices JAOAC Int. 93:442-50 (2010)
 22. Working Group on Prolamin Analysis and Toxicity (WGPAT): Méndez et al. Report of a collaborative trial to investigate the performance of the R5 enzyme linked immunoassay to determine gliadin in gluten-free food. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 17:1053-63 (2005)
 23. DLA Publikation: Performance of ELISA and PCR methods for the determination of allergens in food: an evaluation of six years of proficiency testing for soy (*Glycine max* L.) and wheat gluten (*Triticum aestivum* L.); Scharf et al.; J Agric Food Chem. 61(43):10261-72 (2013)
 24. EFSA (2014) Scientific Opinion on the evaluation of allergenic foods and food ingredients for labelling purposes¹, EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA), European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), Parma, Italy, EFSA Journal 2014;12(11):3894
 25. IRMM, Poms et al.; Inter-laboratory validation study of five different commercial ELISA test kits for determination of peanut residues in cookie and dark chocolate; European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Belgium; GE/R/FSQ/D08/05/2004
 26. Jayasena et al. (2015) Comparison of six commercial ELISA kits for their specificity and sensitivity in detecting different major peanut allergens. J Agric Food Chem. 2015 Feb 18;63(6):1849-55
 27. ASU §64 LFGB L 06.00-56 Bestimmung von Sojaprotein in Fleisch und Fleischerzeugnissen Enzymimmunologisches Verfahren (2007)
 28. ASU §64 LFGB L 00.00-69 Bestimmung von Erdnuss-Kontaminationen in Lebensmitteln mittels ELISA im Mikrotiterplattensystem (2003)
 29. ASU §64 LFGB L 44.00-7 Bestimmung von Haselnuss-Kontaminationen in Schokolade und Schokoladenwaren mittels ELISA im Mikrotiterplattensystem (2006)