



## A European interlaboratory evaluation of PCR and ELISA methods for *Mycoplasma bovis* diagnostics

Aspan, A.; Wisselink, Henk J.; Ridley, Anne; Andersson, A.-M.; Pohjanvirta, Tarja; Pelkonen, Sinikka; Lauritsen, Klara Tølbøl; Kensø, Jane; Larsen, Helene; Høgberg, Jonas

*Total number of authors:*  
12

*Publication date:*  
2018

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

### *Citation (APA):*

Aspan, A., Wisselink, H. J., Ridley, A., Andersson, A.-M., Pohjanvirta, T., Pelkonen, S., Lauritsen, K. T., Kensø, J., Larsen, H., Høgberg, J., Gaurivaud, P., & Tardy, F. (2018). *A European interlaboratory evaluation of PCR and ELISA methods for Mycoplasma bovis diagnostics*. Poster session presented at Medvet Pathogens 2018, Prato, Italy.

---

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# A European interlaboratory evaluation of PCR and ELISA methods for *Mycoplasma bovis* diagnostics

*Mycoplasma bovis* is known worldwide as a major bovine pathogen. Increasing prevalence has been recently reported in Northern Europe. Control of *M. bovis* infections in cattle herds is difficult as increasing antimicrobial resistance is reported, and commercial vaccines are not available or not effective. Therefore, preventive measures such as high biosecurity standards guided by results of a highly specific and sensitive diagnosis are essential.

A consortium of six European national veterinary institutes was established to evaluate the performance of PCR and ELISA diagnostic methods currently used by these institutes. For serodiagnosis two commercial ELISA test kits were used: the Bio K302 ELISA (Bio-X Diagnostics, Rochefort, Belgium) and the ID Screen® *Mycoplasma bovis* ELISA (IDvet, Grabels, France). These two tests were compared to an in-house Western blot method as to be able to use a latent class analysis statistical approach. A sample panel (n=180) was compiled of sera from cattle from five countries with high and low *M. bovis* prevalence. Sera were distributed to the six laboratories and tested as recommended by the suppliers of the test kits. Using latent class analysis, we found that the diagnostic sensitivities of the Western blot, the ID Screen® *Mycoplasma bovis* and the Bio K302 ELISA were 96.6 %, 99.6 % and 51.0 % respectively, and the diagnostic specificities were 99.8 %, 99.0 % and 85.7 % respectively (Table 1) (Andersson et al., manuscript in preparation).

For evaluation of PCR diagnostics, a sample panel was tested using five different DNA extraction methods, seven different real-time and/or end-point PCR methods targeting four different genes and six different real-time PCR platforms. Only one commercial kit was assessed (MPBO50 kit from ThermoFisher Scientific), all other were in-house PCR tests. Three different assays were conducted to assess the specificity, sensitivity and comparability of the PCRs. The sensitivity and comparability assays were conducted using (n=21) bronchoalveolar fluids of veal calves, artificially contaminated or naturally infected. With a few exceptions, all methods run routinely in the participating laboratories showed comparable performance (Figure 1) (Wisselink et al., manuscript submitted for publication).

This work was supported by the

CoVetLab.org

Veterinary Public Health Institutes supporting each other

	Informative priors		Uniform priors	
	Median	95% PCI	Median	95% PCI
<b>Sensitivity &amp; specificity</b>				
Sensitivity WB	0.930	[0.889; 0.966]	0.933	[0.887; 0.969]
Specificity WB	0.998	[0.990; 1.00]	0.999	[0.993; 1.00]
Sensitivity ID Screen	0.956	[0.916; 0.990]	0.958	[0.914; 0.994]
Specificity ID Screen	0.993	[0.983; 0.998]	0.994	[0.985; 0.999]
Sensitivity BIO K302	0.488	[0.444; 0.532]	0.488	[0.443; 0.533]
Specificity BIO K302	0.883	[0.854; 0.908]	0.880	[0.851; 0.906]
<b>Covariances</b>				
CoV <sub>Seq</sub> (WB*IDScreen)	0.037	[0.001; 0.071]	0.035	[0.003; 0.072]
CoV <sub>Sp</sub> (WB*IDScreen)	0.001	[0.000; 0.006]	0.001	[0.000; 0.004]

Table 1. Posterior median and 95% posterior credibility interval (95% PCI) of sensitivity and specificity for Western blot and the two ELISA systems obtained from latent class analysis, assuming conditional independence between tests and using informative or uniform priors.




Figure 1. Comparability of results of various PCR methods in use by six laboratories (Lab 1 to Lab 6) on bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (BALF) samples (n=21) from veal calves from farms with bovine respiratory disease (BRD). BALF samples were tested twice by the PCR methods and the mean Ct values were calculated from the real-time PCRs. Viability of *M. bovis* in the BALF samples was verified with culture. On the basis of the culture results, the figure was split in two parts, either with BALF samples negative or positive for *M. bovis* by culture.

A. Aspán<sup>1</sup>, H.J. Wisselink<sup>2</sup>, A. Ridley<sup>3</sup>, A-M Andersson<sup>4</sup>, T. Pohjanvirta<sup>5</sup>, S Pelkonen<sup>5</sup>, K. T. Lauritsen<sup>6</sup>, J. Kense<sup>6</sup>, H. Larsen<sup>6</sup>, J. Høggberg<sup>6</sup>, P. Gaurivaud<sup>7</sup>, F. Tardy<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>National Veterinary Institute, Department of Microbiology, Uppsala, Sweden.

<sup>2</sup>Wageningen Bioveterinary Research, Department of Infection Biology, Lelystad, The Netherlands.

<sup>3</sup>Animal and Plant Health Agency, Department of Bacteriology, Weybridge, United Kingdom.

<sup>4</sup>National Veterinary Institute, Department of Animal Health and Antimicrobial Strategies, Uppsala, Sweden.

<sup>5</sup>Finnish Food Safety Authority Evira, Research and Laboratory Department, Kuopio, Finland.

<sup>6</sup>National Veterinary Institute Technical University of Denmark, Division of Diagnostics & Scientific Advice, Lyngby, Denmark.

<sup>7</sup>Anses Lyon Laboratory, JRU Ruminants Mycoplasmoses, Anses, VetAgro Sup, University of Lyon, France.

