

<b>Collaborative project</b>	Large-scale integrating project
<b>Project acronym</b>	BASELINE
<b>Project title</b>	Selection and improving of fit-for-purpose sampling procedures for specific foods and risks
<b>Grant Agreement number</b>	222738
<b>Date of latest version of Annex I</b>	01/04/2009

Del. No.	Deliverable name	WP no.	Lead participant	Nature	Dissemination Level	Due delivery date from Annex I
6.4	Characterisation of the statistical distributions of chemical contaminants at CCPs and analysis of WP1-WP5 for multiple/combined combinations	6	HFSO	R	PU	M24

**Delivery Date** 31/7/ 2011

**Project co-ordinator** Prof. Gerardo Manfreda  
Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna  
**Tel:** +39 051 20 9 785  
**E-mail:** gerardo.manfreda@unibo.it

**Project website address** [www.baselineeurope.eu](http://www.baselineeurope.eu)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXPLANATION	6
SUMMARY	7
INTRODUCTION	8
PART 1. DISTRIBUTION OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES IN PRIMARY AND COMPOSITE SAMPLES	15
Introduction	16
Summary of information on the distribution of pesticide residues	16
Basic facts and relationships on sampling	16
Residues reported in individual crop units	17
Residues in composite samples	18
Study of the nature of the distributions of residues in primary samples	18
Nature of the variability of residues in primary samples	18
3.1.1 Fitting parametric distributions on the residues in primary samples	20
3.1.1.1 Distribution of CV values of residues in crop units	21
Distribution of residues in primary samples	21
Nature of distribution of residues in composite samples	22
Modelling sampling distributions	22
Variability of residues in composite samples taken from treated fields	22
Outlook to field to field variation of residues in composite samples	23
PART 2. AFLATOXIN M AND POLICHLORINATED BIPHENYLS IN MILK	24
CONCLUSIONS	24
Figures	25
Tables	43
References	77
Annex 1 Definition of terms used in the report	78
Annex 2. Statistical Sampling - Theoretical Background	80

## List of figures and tables

Figure 1: Distribution of chlorpyrifos-methyl residues in primary ( $n=1$ ) and composite samples of size 5, 10 and 25

Figure 2: Relationship of expected relative standard deviations ( $CV/\sqrt{n}$ ) and calculated CVs

Upper chart: 10000 random samples (sample sizes 5, 10, 25, 100, 120, 200 and 300) were drawn with replacement from a computed distribution with a mean of 1.000 and SD of 0.8000,

Lower chart: 10000 random samples (sample sizes 1, 5, 10, 25) were drawn with replacement from residues measured in apple fruits shown in Figure 1 (mean of 1.000 and SD of 0.88838).

Figure 3: Residues in single increments of parsley leaves and carrot roots taken from treated fields. The number after the crop indicates the field from where the samples were taken.

Figure 4: Residues in individual medium (kiwi and apples) and small (blackcurrant and cherry) fruits taken from treated fields. Figure 5: Residues in individual units of Brassica vegetables (cabbage, kale, chicory) taken from treated fields

Figure 6: Residues in individual units of large crops (cucumber, grape, mango, squash) taken from treated fields

Figure 7: Relative frequency distribution (Y axis) of normalised residues in parsley and carrot primary samples

Figure 8: Relative frequency distribution of the combined normalised residues in primary samples of small fruits ( $N=1982$ )

Figure 9: Relative frequency distribution of normalised residues in primary samples of medium size fruits taken from market samples. Parent population of 7002 residue data with  $\mu=1.0$ ,  $CV=1.05$ .

Figure 10: Distribution of CV values of residues in 10K samples drawn with replacement from computed lognormal parent populations. The parameters of fitted distributions are shown in the text boxes besides the charts. The mean of fitted lognormal distribution  $\mu'$  is shown in the figure as  $\mu'=\mu+\text{@risk shift}$  for facilitating the comparison of the parameters of lognormal distribution with the normal (Gaussian) distribution.

Figure 11: Illustration of fitting lognormal and normal distributions on the relative frequency distribution of residues in composite apple samples of size 5, 10 and 25.

Figure 12: Fitting lognormal and normal distributions on the relative frequency distribution of residues in composite carrot samples

Figure 13: Distribution of dithiocarbamate residues in cabbage samples taken from the markets in Hungary.

Figure 14: Relative frequency distribution of CV values of residues measured in 4 replicate composite samples taken from treated fields.

Apple: 25 orchards, 139 pesticide applications, samples size:10

Gooseberry: 25 fields, 104 pesticide applications, sample size: 10

Lettuce: 30 fields, 42 pesticide applications, sample size: 5

Figure 15: Distribution of PCBs in independent batches of processed milk

Figure 16: Distribution of Aflatoxin M in bulk milk

## Tables

Table 1: Number of samples from which pesticide data were obtained from WP5 and WP7 for statistical analysis

Table 2: Average ( $R_{ave}$ ) and relative standard deviation ( $CV_R$ ) of residues measured in tested fields or lots.

Table 3: Range of CV values of residues observed in individual data sets consisting of 100- 120 crop units

Table 4: Distribution of CV values obtained from 10K random samples drawn with replacement from computed parent population ( $N=500K$ ,  $\mu=1$   $SD=CV=0.8$ )

Table 5: Distribution of CV values obtained from 10K random samples drawn with replacement from computed parent population ( $N=500K$ ,  $\mu=0.9995$   $SD=CV=0.499$ )

Table 6: Parameters of distribution of residues in 1557 individual carrots taken from treated fields and the parametric distribution fitted with @-Risk software

Table 7: Parameters of distribution of residues in 1080 individual parsley taken from treated fields and the parametric distribution fitted with @-Risk software

Table 8: Parameters of distribution of residues in 800 individual potato tubers taken from selected lots and the parametric distribution fitted with @-Risk software

Table 9: Parameters of distribution of residues in 7002 individual medium size fruits taken from selected lots and the parametric distribution fitted with @-Risk software

Table 10: Square of relative difference of input 95% percentiles and the percentile values computed with fitted parametric distributions

Table 11: Descriptive statistics of residues in composite samples of size 5

Table 12: Descriptive statistics of residues in composite samples of size 10

Table 13: Descriptive statistics of residues in composite samples of size 25

Table 14: Descriptive statistics of residues in combined composite samples

Table 15: Percentage difference between the 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the experimental and the fitted distributions

Table 16: Square of relative differences between the P0.95 and P0.98 centiles of experimental sampling and fitted distributions for sample size 5

Table 17: Square of relative differences between the P0.95 and P0.98 centiles of experimental sampling and fitted distributions for sample size 10

Table 18: Square of relative differences between the P0.95 and P0.98 centiles of experimental sampling and fitted distributions for sample size 25

Table 19: Parameters of shift-lognormal distribution fitted on various data sets by @-Risk programme

Table 20: Summary of squares of relative differences

Table 21: Descriptive statistics of the distribution of  $CV_R$  values obtained from replicate composite field samples

Table 22: Between field variability of residues in composite samples

Table 23 Descriptive statistical parameters of PCB and Aflatoxin M contamination in milk samples

## EXPLANATION

The main objectives of the WP6 are

- Review of existing and define of new mathematical models in predictive microbiology
- To investigate correlations between food risk factors and traceable environmental parameters and contamination indicators
- To consolidate existing and new models for microbial growth as a function of intrinsic environmental factors and extrinsic parameters

**The delivery D6.4** 'Characterisation of the statistical distributions of chemical contaminants at CCPs and analysis of WP1-WP5 for multiple/combined combinations' contributes to the second objective through characterising the distribution of chemical contaminants and pesticide residues in primary and composite samples as a prerequisite for the determination of sampling uncertainty and an efficient elaboration of risk-based sampling strategies.

Specifically, D6.4 addresses the Sub-task 6.2.2 Elaboration of Sampling strategies for Chemical Contaminants, and for Task 7.2. Estimation of uncertainty of sampling carried out according to the sampling methods specified in EU protocols by investigating the statistical distributions of chemical contaminants.

For chemical contaminants and pesticide and veterinary residues the critical control point (CCP) is the time when the food is marketed or offered for sale at the first time.

Delivery D6.4 provides the results of the statistical analysis of the distribution of residues and chemical contaminants in food representing two distinctly different situations. The analyte concentration distributions exhibit a continuous, typically unimodal but strongly skewed pattern. Whereas the distribution of pesticide residues in fruits and vegetables is very heterogeneous, the PCBs and Aflatoxin M contamination in bulk milk batches can be considered well-mixed and compared with the analytical uncertainty it has negligible sampling uncertainty

The statistical analyses presented in D6.4 have been performed based on the data collected or generated by WP3 and WP5 for the identified food-risk combinations, and by WP7 on residues in crop units (primary samples). In addition, data on pesticide residues in or on crop units, were collected from scientific literature and included in the evaluations of D6.4.

## Summary

In order to provide a comprehensive and complete coverage, this report contains all results obtained within the activities related to WP6 and relevant for D6.4 during the implementation of the project.

Pesticide residue data obtained within the programme of WP5 and WP 7, as well as from the scientific literature were used for the characterization of the nature of the distribution of pesticide residues in crop units and composite samples. The 19637 residue data representing the normal agriculture practice in 15 countries from 4 continents are suitable for drawing generally applicable conclusions.

The nature of the distribution of pesticide residues in crop units were examined using graphical statistical representations of the residue levels at randomly selected positions on the treated fields, and the probability density functions of the residues were calculated. Further on, various parametric distributions were fitted to the experimental data to determine if any of them can be used to reliably describe the nature of the residue distributions. The goodness of the fit was characterised with the sum of squares of the relative differences of the selected percentiles (e.g. 95 or 98) of the input experimental data and the fitted distributions. Generally the lognormal distribution gave the best fit for the relative frequency distributions of residues.

The range of residues observed in field experiments and market samples was characterised by the relative standard deviation (CV) enabling the comparison of data sets with different mean values. The effect of sample size on the parameters of the distribution of residues was studied with drawing random samples with replacement from the experimental data sets.

In view of the wide variation of CV values observed in simulated data sets, the differences in CV values of residues measured in primary samples cannot be considered significant. Therefore, the variation of residues which might have resulted from the nature of the crops, physical-chemical properties of the pesticides, methods of application, and the actual field and weather conditions cannot be distinguished with samples of size 100-120 available from a single field or lot.

The average of CV values obtained in individual residue data sets consisting of over 100 data gave the best estimate for the variability of residues in the parent population. The CV values of residues in composite samples were inversely proportional to the square of sample size enabling the estimation of variability of residues in composite samples of various sizes from the CV value of residues in primary samples.

The estimated typical variability of residues in *fruits and vegetables* expressed as CV in primary (n=1) and composite samples of size 5, 10 and 25 were:

Sample size	1	5	10	25
CV (Market samples)	1.1	0.47	0.34	0.21
CV (Field samples <sup>1</sup> )	0.8	0.356	0.25	0.16
CV (Brassica leafy and leafy vegetables)	0.7	0.31	0.22	0.14

### 1. Except Brassica leafy and leafy vegetables

The larger variability of residues in market samples compared to field samples is attributed to the potential mixing of lots and the larger proportion of residues below the LOQ in market samples.



The leafy vegetables are grown flat on the soil surface and the pesticide deposit is probably more uniform than in case of fruit trees, bushes or greenhouse crops grown on cordons.

The above estimates are not applicable for cereal grains and small seeds because no residue data were available for these crops.

The average variability of residues in replicate composite field samples were somewhat higher than those estimated from residues in crop units, but they were within the 95% confidence interval (0.10-0.46) for the estimated typical CV values (Ambrus & Soboleva, 2004).