



Flock sensitivity and specificity of pooled fecal qPCR and pooled serum ELISA for screening ovine paratuberculosis

Fabien Corbiere, Yoann Mathevon, Gilles Foucras INRAE, National Veterinary School of Toulouse, France





Introduction

• Challenges with paratuberculosis surveillance in small ruminants



Study objectives

- Evaluate the performance of screening strategies based on pooled fecal or serum samples
 - Experimental study: analytical performance of serum ELISA and qPCR applied to pooled-samples
 - Simulation study: epidemiological performance of screening strategies based on pooled-sample analysis
 - Sensitivity and specificity at the flock level
 - Infection prevalence estimation based on results from pooled-samples
 - Use in long-term flock monitoring





Material and methods : experimental study

oles	Pooled fecal samples	nples	Pooled serum samples	
amples	595 pools of 5 or 10 individual sampl	amples	362 pools of 5 or 10 individual samples	Numbers
h Ct) w Ct)	All negative 1 weekly positive (high Ct) 1 strongly positive (low Ct)	jative ive (low S/P value) e (high S/P value)	All negative 1 ou 2 weekly positive (low 1 strongly positive (high S	Composition
real time	qPCR : Adiavet ParaTB real t Package qpcR	raTB screening ive threshold	Serum ELISA : Idexx ParaTB scr New (lowered) positive thre	Analysis & interpretation
lt Jlt	' pools with positive result ' pools with negative result	tivity: proportion of 'pos ficity: proportion of 'nega	Analytical sensitivity: p Analytical specificity: pr	Judging criteria
	' pools with positive resul ' pools with negative resu	tivity: proportion of 'pos icity: proportion of 'nega	Analytical sensitivity: p Analytical specificity: pr	Judging criteria

Material and methods : simulation study



Results: analytical performance of pooled-sample analysis

Technique	Pool composition	Number of pools ——	% of pools detected positive	
			Pools of size 5	Pools of size 10
Serum ELISA	Negative	102 + 102	0	0
	1 lowly positive	37 + 37	62.2	62.2
	2 lowly positive	21 + 21	100.0	100.0
	1 strongly positive	21 + 21	100.0	100.0
Fecal qPCR	Negative	40 + 40	0	0
	1 lowly positive	73 + 83	89.0	68.2
	1 strongly positive	122 + 125	99.2	100.0





Results : flock level performance of screening strategies



Results : flock level performance of screening strategies



Results : flock level performance of screening strategies



Results : estimated prevalence of infection based on pooled-sample analysis

Fecal qPCR

15 21 21

22 22 14

18 7

15 20

14 23

22 23



INSTITUT DE idele

nationale vétérinaire





= proportion of simulation runs with that number of positive pools, for this given infection prevalence





Results : usefulness in long term flock surveillance

	Strategy 1	Strategy 2	Strategy 3
Number of pools / year	10	10	10
Pool size	5	5	10
Number of years	3	5	5

Estimated prevalence of infection (upper 95%CI)						
0 positive pool	< 5 %	< 2.5 %	< 1%			
1 ou 2 positive pool(s)	< 10 %	< 5 %	< 2.5 %			





Discussion and conclusion

- Analytical performance of pooled-sample analysis
 - Depends on the composition of the pools
 - Good to excellent for pools up to 10 or 20
 - Even if only one low shedder per pool
- Epidemiological performance of screening strategies
 - Based on pooled-serum samples: major lack of specificity
 - Related to a imperfect specificity at the individual level : 94.0 % (95%PCI : 92.2 95.7) (Mathevon et al, 2017)
 - Based on qPCR of pooled-fecal samples
 - High sensitivity for infection prevalence > 5 à 10 %
 - May help defining flocks as at "low risk of infection" if applied several years





Interested in more details ?

O PLOS ONE

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Flock sensitivity and specificity of pooled fecal qPCR and pooled serum ELISA for screening ovine paratuberculosis

Yoann Mathevon, Gilles Foucras, Fabien Corbière * UMR INRA ENVT 1225 IHAP, Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire de Toulouse, Toulouse Cedex, France

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0226246









Thank you for your attention.

Any question ?

fabien.corbiere@envt.fr



